RECEIVED PEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

| | 2009 J | UL 22 PM 4: 47 | FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION 999 E Street, N.W. |
|--------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| | 3 | CELA | Washington, D.C. 20463 |
| | 5 | _ | FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT |
| | 6 7 8 | | MUR: 6152 DATE COMPLAINT FILED: December 22, 2008 |
| | 9 | | DATE SUPPLEMENT FILED: February 3, 2009 DATE OF NOTIFICATION: December 31, 2008 |
| | 10 11 | | DATE OF NOTIFICATION DATE OF NOTIFICATION |
| | 12 13 | | OF SUPPLEMENT: February 4, 2009 LAST RESPONSE RECEIVED: March 5, 2009 |
| | 14 | | DATE ACTIVATED: March 31, 2009 |
| i i | 15 16 17 | | EXPIRATION OF SOL: Ostober 29, 2013 |
| | 18 19 20 | COMPLAINANT: | Nadira (Daiza) Plater |
| | 21 22 23 24 | RESPONDENTS: | Martin Manna Chaldean Chamber Political Action Committee and Martin Manna, in his official capacity as treasurer |
| | 2 <u>5</u> 2 6 27 28 | · | Chaldenn-American Chamber of Commerce Knollenberg for Congress Committee and Debra Kling, in her official capacity as treasurer |
| | 2 9 30 | RELEVANT STATUTE | |
| | 31 32 | AND REGULATIONS | 2 U.S.C. § 433 2 U.S.C. § 434(b) |
| | 33 | | 2 U.S.C. § 441a |
| | 34 | | 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a) |
| | 35 36 | | 11 C.F.R. § 100.26 11 C.F.R. § 100.27 |
| | 37 | | 11 C.F.R. § 100.52 |
| | 38 | | 11 C.F.R. § 100.111 |
| | 39 | | 11 C.F.R. § 109.20 |
| | 40 | | 11 C.F.R. § 110.11 |
| | 41 42 | INTERNAL REPORTS | CHECKED: Disclosure reports |
| | 43 44 45 | FEDERAL AGENCIES | CHECKED: None |

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 2 of 14

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

This matter involves allegations made by Complainant in connection with a letter 2 purportedly sent by a group called the "Chaldeans for Congressman Joe Knollenberg" that 3 advocated the re-election of Representative Joe Knollenberg. Specifically, the Complaint and its 4 supplement, allege that the letter lacked a proper disclaimer; that the entity sending the letter 5 failed to remister and recest with the Consumption as a political permuitive and disclose any disbursements made in connection with the mailer, as required by the Act; and may be se made 7 an unreported in-kind contribution or indepredent expanditure by using the mailing list 8 developed and maintained by the "Chaldean News" to distribute the mailer. The complaint also 9 alleged that the Chaldean Chamber Political Action Committee ("Chaldean Chamber PAC") may 10 have been involved in the letter because the return address on the letter is the address of the PAC. 11 12 As discussed further below, the information provided in response to the Complaint shows that the letter was actually created, disseminated and paid for by Martin Manna, the treasurer of 13 the Chaldean Chamber PAC, but that he acted in his individual canacity. It appears that the letter 14 was a public communication that contained express advocacy of a federal candidate, but did not 15 16 include a disclaimer as required by the Ast. In addition, the available information suggests that the letter was anandmeted with Representative Knollemberg said a committee staff person and 17 thus may constitute an in-kind contribution from Manna to the Knellenberg for Congress 18 Committee ("Knollenberg Committee"). Because Manna was the source of and paid the costs of 19 the letter, we recommend that the Commission find no reason to believe that the Chaldean 20 Chamber Political Action Committee and its connected organization, the Chaldean-American 21 Chamber of Commerce violated any provision of the Act or the Commission's regulations in 22

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 3 of 14

- connection with the allegations in this matter. We further recommend that, due to the de minimis
- 2 nature of the amount in violation, the Commission exercise it prosecutorial discretion and
- dismiss this matter as to Martin Manna and the Knollenberg Committee.

4 IL FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 5 On or about October 28, 2008, a letter titled "Chaldeans for Congressman Joe
- 6 Knollenberg" was sent to 1,530 households in Michigan's 9th Congressional District. The letter
- 7 praises the accomplishments of Representative Knotlenberg, the incumbent candidate in the 2008
- 8 general election, and concludes with the statement "[p]lease join us in casting your ballot for
- 9 Congressman Joe Knollenberg on Tuesday, November 4th." Complaint at Attachment 1. The
- 10 letter lists the names of eighteen individuals who apparently support the message, and an address
- appears at the bottom of the letter. The return address on the envelope containing the letter
- shows the name "Chaldeans for Knollenberg" and has the same address that appears at the
- 13 bottom of the letter.
- 14 The original complaint alleges that the letter is a public communication that "clearly
- 15 advocates for the election of a candidate for federal office," but it is missing the required
- 16 authorization statement indicating whether a combidate or candidate's committee authorized the
- 17 communication. Complaint at 1; are 2 U.K.C. § 441d(a); 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.26, 10fl.27, and
- 18 110.11. In addition, the complaint appears to mise decists as to whether the letter was netually
- 19 paid for by "Chaldeans for Congressman Joe Knollenberg," noting that the address listed for the

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 4 of 14

- organization on the letter is the same address as the Chaldean Chamber PAC. Martin Manna
- 2 serves as the treasurer of the Chaldean Chamber PAC. The complaint then infers, based on the
- number of likely recipients, that the letter exceeded the \$1,000 reporting threshold, and asserts
- 4 that neither "Chaldeans for Congressman Joe Knollenberg" nor the Chaldean Chamber PAC is
- registered and reporting with the Commission. 2 U.S.C. §§ 433 and 434(b). Further,
- 6 Complainent submitted a supplement to the complaint which alleges that the respondents may
- 7 have made an unreported in-kind contribution or independent expenditures in connection with the
- 8 letter by using a mailing list developed and maintained by the "Chaldean News" to distribute the
- 9 letter. 2 U.S.C. § 434(b); 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.52 and 100.111. In the supplement, Complainant
- 10 states that the letter was addressed to her using her maiden name (Nadira Daiza). However,
- 11 Complainant explains that she has not used that name in 35 years except to subscribe to a
- 12 publication called the Chaldean News and that the Chaldean News is the only mailing she has
- 13 received under her maiden name. Complainant further states that the Chaldean News shares the
- same address as the Chaldean Chamber PAC and the return address listed on the Knollenberg
- 15 mailer. Thus, the complainant alleges that the respondents' use of the Chaldean News mailing
- 16 list results in a contribution or expenditure.
 - In a joint response to the Complaint, the Cheidean Chember PAC and its commetted
- 18 organization, the Chaldean-American Chamber of Commerce, explains that the "Chaldeans for
- 19 Congressman Joe Knollenberg" is not a real organization, but rather it is an "expression of

¹ The Chaldesn Chamber Political Action is registered as a state political committee in Michigan, but is not registered and reporting with the Commission. See

http://www.chaldeanchamber.com/joomla/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&itemid=44 (last visited June 27, 2009). The complaint refers to the Chaldean Chamber Political Action Committee as the Chaldean Chamber of Commerce Political Action Committee, presumably as a result of a simple error. We will refer to the PAC as the "Chaldean Chamber PAC" throughout this report.

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 5 of 14

solidarity" by persons supporting the candidate. Chaldean Response at 2. The response averred
that the Chaldean Chamber PAC had nothing to do with the letter, and asserted that it was
actually Martin Manna, the Chaldean Chamber PAC's treasurer, who prepared and paid for the
letter, but that he did so in his individual capacity, and not on behalf of the Chaldean-American
Chamber of Commerce or its PAC. See Chaldean Response at 3.

Although Manna had received notification of the complaint in his official capacity as
treasurer of the PAC upon the Commission's receipt of the nonsplaint, after revisesing the
information in the Chaldean Response, we notified Manna in his individual capacity of the

treasurer of the PAC upon the Commission's rescipt of the mossplaint, after reviewing the information in the Chaldean Response, we notified Manna in his individual capacity of the allegations and informed him that we obtained information that he was the sole source of the mailer, and invited him to submit any factual or legal materials relevant to the allegations. In response, Manna submitted more detailed information concerning the mailer, acknowledging that he paid approximately \$740 of his own funds (\$630 in stamps, \$40 in paper and \$70 in envelopes) to mail the letter, which was sent to approximately 1,500 households with Chaldean-American members. Manna Response at 4. The response also indicated that Manna used a variety of sources to obtain names for the mailing list for the letter, including publicly available directories from various Chaldean American American Chardean News and the Chaldean American Chardean Chardean Commerce which are only available to members but are free of charge. Id. at 2.

Finally, the response stated that Manna discussed the letter and its contents with Representative Knollenberg and Bryce Sandler, a campaign staff member. *Id.* at 3. Manna asserts that he contacted the candidate on several occasions and "specifically advised" him of the letter and its contents, and the candidate "orally approved the letter." *Id.* Manna contends that

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 6 of 14

- because he was sending such a letter for the first time, he wanted to do it properly and consulted
- with Bryce Sandler, a person who was identified as the Committee's "point" and "liaison" person
- and "a key campaign committee member of the candidate." Id. at 4. Manna reportedly called
- Sandler on at least three occasions, advised him of the contents of the letter, and asked whether
- the letter needed a disclaimer and what he had to do to avoid problems. Id. Sandler told Manna
- 6 "there would be no problem." Id. The response stresses that Manna had a very clear recollection
- 7 of the discussion with Sandler, that the letter was apprelimited with both the sandidate and the
- 8 candidate's committee, and that the latter would not have been sent without this coordination.
- 9 Id. Manna contends that "[t]here was no 'specific endorsement'" but the candidate clearly
- supported the letter and its contents. Id. Finally, on October 28, 2008, Manna advised the
- 11 Committee through an email to Sandler that the letter was being mailed and provided an estimate
- of the cost for the letter. Id. The response included a copy of the email which states, in relevant
- part, "This hit just about every Chaldean household in the district. Just so you know, I love Joe
- dearly and personally paid for the letter/postage (about \$2,000). Should hit homes tomorrow."²
- 15 Id. at Attachment 1.
- 16 Boyere Sandler filed a response to the complaint on behalf of the Krallenbour fee
- 17 Congress Committee ("the Knollenberg Committee") indicating that the letter did not come from
- 18 Knollenberg or the Knallenberg Committee, was not paid for by Knollenberg or the Knollenberg
- 19 Committee and was not authorized by Knollenberg or the Knollenberg Committee.

² The \$2,000 was apparently Manna's initial estimate of the costs of the letter, costs which he subsequently itemized and aggregated at only \$740. The costs of the letter were not reported as in-kind contributions by the Knollenberg Committee. However, the Knollenberg Committee disclosure reports reflect that Manna made a \$1,175 in-kind contribution, dated October 25, 2008, for "advertising," apparently related to a Knollenberg advertisement published in a Chaldean newspaper and funded by Manna, and a \$500 direct contribution, dated October 29, 2008.

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 7 of 14

Ш <u>ANALYSIS</u>

1

22

| A. | Alleged Failure | to Register as a | Political Co | mmittee |
|----------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|---------|
| <i>-</i> | Unicase Literation | A TANKTON OF I | A VIIIII V | |

2 3 The complaint alleges that the entity responsible for the letter violated the Act by failing 4 to register and report as a federal political committee, noting that neither "Chaldeans for 5 Knollenberg" or the Chaldean Chamber PAC, are registered and reporting with the Commission. 6 Complaint at 2. See 2 U.S.C. §§ 433 and 434(b). The Act defines a "political examittee" as any 7 committee, club, association, or other group of persons that receives "contributions" or makes "expenditures" for the purpose of influencing a federal election which apprepate in expess of 9 \$1,000 during a calendar year. 2 U.S.C. § 431(4)(A). To address overbreadth concerns, the 10 Supreme Court has held that only organizations whose major purpose is campaign activity can 11 potentially qualify as political committees under the Act. See, e.g., Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1. 12 79 (1976); FEC v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life, 479 U.S. 238, 262 (1986). 13 As discussed above, the available information indicates that, although the letter lists 14 eighteen individuals who apparently supported the message in the letter, it was the product of an 15 individual, Martin Manna, who created, disseminated and paid for it, not the product of a group 16 called "Chaldenns for Conguesseem Jee Knollenberg." In addition, at \$740, the costs of the letter 17 18 fall below the \$1,000 threshold of 2 U.S.C. § 431(4)(A). Besel on the above, we resomenced that the Commission find no reason to believe that the Chaldean Chamber Political Action 19 Committee and Martin Manna, in his official capacity as treasurer, or its connected organization, 20 21 the Chaldean American Chamber of Commerce, violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of

1971, as amended, in connection with the allegations in this matter.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

B. Alleged Failure to Include a Disclaimer in a Communication

The complaint alleges that "the letter does not contain any disclaimer notice on either the letter or envelope," although it is a public communication which "must 'clearly state the name and permanent street address of the person who paid for the communication and state that the communication is not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee." Complaint at 1. The complaint assues that the sexult is that, "it is impossible to conclude whether the letter was paid for and authorized by Congressman Jac Knollenburg, committees whem he is affiliated with, or by independent committees." Id. The Act requires a disclaimer to appear on any public communication by any person that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate or solicits funds in connection with a Federal election. 2 U.S.C. § 441d. The disclaimer notice must state, inter alia, who paid for the communication and whether it was authorized by a candidate, an authorized political committee of a candidate, or its agents. Id. A public communication includes a mass mailing (more than 500 substantially similar mailings within 30 days). See 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a); 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.26, 100.27, and 110.11. Express advocacy is defined as including any communication that uses phrases such as "Vote for the President." "re-elect your Congressman," "support the Democratic nominee," "cast your ballot for the Republican challenger for U.S. Senate in Georgia," and "Smith for Congress." 11 C.F.R. § 100,22(a). The available information indicates that the letter at issue here required a disclaimer stating who paid for the communication and whether it was authorized by a candidate or a candidate's committee or their agents. First, Manna stated that the letter was sent to 1500 21

individuals, and therefore, it was a mass mailing. 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a); 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.26,

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Coursel's Reptirt Page 9 of 14

- 1 100.27, and 110.11. Second, the letter expressly advocates the re-election of Joe Knollenberg.
- 2 The letter praises the accomplishments of Representative Knollenberg, a Federal candidate, and
- 3 closes with the statement "[p]lease join us in casting your ballot for Congressman Joe
- 4 Knollenberg on Tuesday, November 4th." This language clearly falls within the definition of
- 5 express advocacy. 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a)

Although the Act required the letter to contain a disclaimer, it failed to do so. The name "Chaldeans for Congressment Joe Knadlenberg" appears at the top of the letter, but it does not state whether the group paid for letter, and available information establishes not only that the group did not pay for the letter, but that the group does not even exist. Nor was the letter paid for by the eighteen individuals whose names appear at the bottom of the letter. Instead, it appears that the letter was created, disseminated and paid for by only one of the eighteen individuals. Martin Manna. Nor does the letter contain a statement indicating whether it was authorized by a candidate, a candidate's committee, or an agent of a candidate. As a result, Manna violated 2 U.S.C. § 441d by not including a proper disclaimer on the letter. However, due to the de minimis nature of the activity at issue we do not think it is a prudent use of the Commission's limited resources to pursue this violation. Accordingly, we recommend that the councie its prosecutorial diametica to dismiss the disclaimer allegation and issue a cautionary latter recommending that Mr. Manna take steps to ensure that appropriate disclaimers are included in future communications expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 441d and 11 C.F.R. § 110.11. See Heckler v. Chaney, 270 U.S. 821 (1985).

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 10 of 14

C. **Alleged Reporting Violation**

1 The supplement to the complaint alleges that the respondents may have made, but failed 2 to report, an in-kind contribution or independent expenditure in connection with the letter by 3 using a mailing list developed and maintained by the "Chaldean News" to distribute the letter. 4 explaining that Martin Manna and another individual who signed the Chaldeans for 5 Congression Jun Knollenberg letter are sumagers of the publication. 2 U.S.C. § 434(b); 6 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.52 and 100.111. 7 The Act defines the term "contribution" to include any gift, subscription, loan, advance, 8 or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any 9 10 11 made by any person "in cooperation, consultation, or concert, with, or at the request or 12

election for Federal office." 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i); 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(a). The term "anything of value" includes membership lists and mailing lists. 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(d)(1). An expenditure suggestion of, a candidate, his authorized political committees or their agents" constitutes an inkind contribution to the candidate. 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(7)(B)(i). A communication is coordinated with a candidate, a candidate's authorized committee, or agent of either when the communication satisfies the three-prenged test set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a): (1) the communication is said for by a person other than a candidate, the candidate communities, or an agent of either; (2) the communication satisfies at least one of the content standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c); and (3) the communication satisfies at least one of the conduct standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d).

Manna acknowledges paying for the letter. Manna Response at 4. Therefore, the payment prong of 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a)(1) is satisfied. The content prong is also satisfied MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 11 of 14

- because the letter is a public communication that contains express advocacy. See 11 C.F.R.
- 2 § 109.21(c)(3) and discussion supra at 8. The conduct prong of the coordinated communications
- regulations is satisfied if, among other things, the communication is created, produced, or
- 4 distributed at the suggestion of a person paying for the communication and the candidate,
- 5 authorized committee, or agent thereof, assents to the suggestion; if the candidate, authorized
- 6 committee, er agent is "materially involved in decisions" regarding the content of the
- 7 communication, intersied audience, means or made of the communication, specific media outlet
- 8 used, timing or frequency of the communication, or size or prominence of a printed
- 9 communication or duration of a communications by means of a broadcast, cable or satellite; or if
- 10 a communication is created, produced or distributed after one or more substantial discussions
- between the person paying for the communication and the candidate, candidate's committee, or
- agent thereof. 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d). Based on the available information regarding the
- 13 purported conversations between Manna and the Knollenberg Committee, it appears that the
- 14 letter may have been created, produced, or distributed at the suggestion of Manna and that
- 15 Knollenberg assented to the letter. It is also possible that Knollenberg and/or Sandler may have
- 16 been resterially involved in ducisions reparalleg the letter or that the letter was created, engineed.
- 17 or distributed after one or more substantial discussions between Manual and Knollesburg and
- 18 Manna and Sandier. See discussion supra at 5-6. However, in the Committee's response to the
- 19 complaint, Sandler stated that the letter did not come from the Committee and/or candidate and
- 20 that neither the candidate nor the Committee paid for or authorized the letter. See Sandler
- 21 Response. The letter makes no mention of any discussions with Manna regarding the letter or
- 22 any other involvement.

MUR 6152 (Martin Manna, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 12 of 14

An in-kind contribution is treated as both a "contribution" to and an "expenditure" by the

- 2 political committee receiving the in-kind contribution. 11 C.F.R §§ 100.111(e); 104.13(a)(2).
- 3 An authorized committee of a candidate must report and itemize all contributions received from
- 4 individuals that aggregate in excess of \$200 per election cycle. 2 U.S.C. § 434(b); 11 C.F.R.
- 5 § 104.3(a)(4). An in-kind contribution must also be reported as an expenditure on the same report.
- 6 11 C.F.R. §§ 104.3(b) and 104.13(a)(2).

It appears that the disbussements made in connection with the letter, including any value

associated with the use of a pre-existing mailing list, should have been reported either as an

9 independent expenditure, or, if coordinated with Knollenberg, as both a contribution to and an

10 expenditure by the Knollenberg Committee. The available information provided some evidence

that the communication was coordinated with Knollenberg. Nevertheless, even if the

12 expenditure was coordinated, the value of any mailing lists used to distribute the letter is

unknown, is likely to be minimal, and would be difficult to ascertain because the lists are not

14 commercially available. For these reasons, we do not think it is a prudent use of the

15 Commission's limited resources to engage in an investigation to determine the value of the lists

and whether the letter was in fact coordinated with the Knullenberg Committee. Given the look

of information and the st minima amoure of the vicisting, we recommend that the exercise its

prosecutorial discretion to dismiss the allegation of the failure to report the dishumenents made

in connection with the letter, and close the file. See Heckler v. Chaney, 270 U.S. 821 (1985).

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Find no reason to believe that Chaldean-American Chamber of Commerce violated the Federal filection Campaign Act of 1971, as americal, in connection with the allegations in this matter.

16

17

18

20

21

22

| 1 2 | 2. | Martin Manna, in | his official capac | dean Chamber Political Action Committee and ity as treusurer, violated the Federal Election |
|---------------------|------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|
| 3 4 | | Campaign Act of matter. | 1971, as amended | I, in connection with the allegations in this |
| 5 6 | 3. | | = | l discretion the allegations that Martin Manna, |
| 7 8 | | in his individual (| capacity, violated | the Act and send a cautionary letter. |
| 9 10 11 12 | 4. | | - | l discretion the allegations that Knollenberg for ing, in her official capacity as treasurer, |
| 13 | 5. | Approve the atten | ches Factual and I | egal Analyses. |
| 15 16 | 6. | Approve the appr | ropriate letters. | |
| 17 18 | 7. | Close the file. | | |
| 19 20 | | | | Thomasenia P. Duncan General Counsel |
| 21 22 23 | | | | General Counsel |
| 24 25 | 1-2 | .2-09 | BY: | KHL H.GHP |
| 26 27 28 | Date | | | Kathleen M. Guith Deputy Associate General Counsel for Enforcement |
| 29 30 | | | • | |
| 31 32 | | | | Vot 106 |
| 33 34 | | | | Assistant General Counsel |
| 35 36 | | | | |
| 37 38 | | | | Dominique Dillenseger |
| 39 40 | | | | Dominique Dillenseger Attorney |
| 41 42 | 1 | | | |

| 1 | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| } | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |